



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,665	06/27/2003	Kathryn G. Rasmussen	03797.00448	8043
28319	7590	11/30/2006	EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF LTD., ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NOS. 003797 & 013797 1001 G STREET , N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597			BONSHOCK, DENNIS G	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2173		
DATE MAILED: 11/30/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/607,665	RASMUSSEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dennis G. Bonshock	2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim appears to have a semicolon between “colors” and “heights” where a comma should reside. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2, 6-12, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anuff et al., Pub. No.: US 2003/0056026 A1, hereinafter Anuff.

4. With regard to claim 1, which teaches a system for simplified implementation of adaptable user interfaces, the system comprising: at least one content module that contains content, wherein the content is unformatted with respect to visual characteristics; at least one navigation module, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 48, 133, and 138, a system for modifying a user interface, the interface comprising both content elements and navigational elements, where the interface optionally doesn't have a default branding. With regard to claim 1, which further teaches a framework, wherein at

least one of the at least one content module and the at least one navigation module are inserted into the framework, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 60, a framework for managing the look and feel of the sites content and navigational links. With regard to claim 1, which further teaches a formatting specification that includes a standardized set of flexible styles, attribute of which are set for defining a plurality of visual characteristics of at least one of the at least one content module, the at least one navigation module, and at least a portion of the framework, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 133, defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of the site, the branding including a theme and structure establishing a collection of styles for a site. Anuff further teaches, in paragraphs 139 and 136, branding of the layout (structure).

5. With regard to claim 2, which further teaches wherein the framework includes at least one container that includes at least one row that includes at least one column, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 135 and in figure 20, the framework including at least one container that includes at least one row that includes at least one column.

6. With regard to claims 6 and 16, which further teach wherein the plurality of visual characteristics are selected from: colors; heights, widths, spacing around an element, spacing within an element, background images, borders, and fonts, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 45, 134, and 135, visual characteristics including colors, fonts (letter height and width), layout characteristics, image files, and spacing around elements, for applying specific style attributes to content.

Art Unit: 2173

7. With regard to claims 7, 9, 12, and 18, which further teach web-page user interface generated by the system of claim 1, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 135, the system being implemented for web-page user interface generation.
8. With regard to claim 8, which teaches a method of providing at least one adaptable user interface, the method comprising: inserting at least a first content module and at least a first navigation module into a framework, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 48, 133, and 138, a system for modifying a user interface, the interface comprising both content elements and navigational elements Anuff further teaches, in paragraph 60, a framework for managing the look and feel of the sites content and navigational links. With regard to claim 8, which further teaches defining, by setting a first set of attributes of a standardized set of styles, a first plurality of visual characteristics of at least a portion of each of the first content module, the first navigation module, and the framework; and combining the framework, including the first content module and the first navigation module, with the attributes of the standardized set of styles to render a first user interface, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 133, defining a look and feel (branding) for the UI of the pages and navigations structure of the site, the branding including a theme and structure establishing a collection of styles for a site. Anuff further teaches, in paragraphs 139 and 136, branding of the layout (structure).
9. With regard to claim 10, which teaches further comprising: defining, by setting a second set of attributes of the standardized set of styles, a second plurality of visual characteristics of at least a portion of at least one of the first content module, the first navigation module, and the framework; and combining the framework, including at least

one of the first content module and the first navigation module, with the second plurality of visual characteristics to render a second user interface that has a different appearance than the first user interface, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 133-135, and initial setting of a look and feel for content and navigational links in a site and then a defining of a second set of look and feel style characteristics for a site, different from the first, that are then used for effecting the display of the UI on the display.

10. With regard to claim 11, which teaches further comprising: inserting at least one of at least a second content module and at least a second navigation module into the framework; defining, by setting a second set of attributes for the standardized set of styles, a second plurality of visual characteristics of at least a portion of each of the second content module, the second navigation module, and the framework; and combining the framework, including at least one of the second content module and the second navigation module, with the second plurality of visual characteristics to render a second user interface that has a different appearance than the first user interface, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 133 and 135, a plurality of sets of content objects/pages, and further teaches, in paragraphs 139 and 140, a plurality of sets of navigational components. Anuff further teaches, in paragraph 133, associating different styles with different elements (pages) in the webpage, and grouping the elements (pages) to form a single theme.

11. With regard to claim 17, which further teaches a computer-readable medium containing computer-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 8, Anuff

teaches, in paragraph 13, a computer-readable medium containing computer-executable instructions for implementing site customization.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 3, 4, 13, and 14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff and Kanevsky et al., Pub. No.: US 2002/0089546 A1, hereinafter Kanevsky.

14. With regard to claims 3 and 13, which further teach wherein at least one of the framework containers that a content module or navigation module is inserted into expands to fit the inserted content module or the inserted navigation module, Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133), but doesn't specifically show containers adapting to content. Kanevsky teaches a system for reformatting the GUI (see paragraph 5), similar to that of Anuff, but further teaches, in paragraphs 5-10 and 23, dynamically sizing the containers based on the content inserted into the container, where a user sets a minimum and a maximum window dimension. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff and Kanevsky before him at the time the invention was made to modify adaptable user interface of Anuff, to include the

sizing of the frame based on the content, as did Kanevsky. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allows for viewing of a maximum amount content within a container without need for scrolling.

15. With regard to claims 4 and 14, which further teach wherein the framework includes a plurality of containers at least one of which shrinks thereby effectively disappearing from a displayed user interface, Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133), but doesn't specifically show containers adapting to content. Kanevsky teaches a system for reformatting the GUI (see paragraph 5), similar to that of Anuff, but further teaches, in paragraphs 5-10 and 23, dynamically sizing the containers based on the content inserted into the container, where a user sets a minimum and a maximum window dimension, and further allows for a transparent window. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff and Kanevsky before him at the time the invention was made to modify adaptable user interface of Anuff, to include the sizing of the frame based on the content, as did Kanevsky. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allows for viewing of a maximum amount content within a container without need for scrolling and without consuming extraneous screen space.

16. Claims 5, 15, 19, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff and Olander et al., Pub. No.: US 2005/0005243 A1, hereinafter Olander.

Art Unit: 2173

17. With regard to claims 5, 15, and 22, which further teach wherein the standardized set of styles is instantiated in a Cascading Style Sheet document, Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133), but doesn't specifically state using Cascading Style Sheets. Olander teaches the customization of web pages and their corresponding links (see paragraphs 25, 30, and 32), similar to that of Anuff, but further teaches applying a look and feel through the use of cascading style sheets (CSS) (see paragraph 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff and Olander before him at the time the invention was made to modify the formatting method of Anuff to make use of CSS. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because CSS are known in the art to provide appearance information to web documents.

18. With regard to claim 19, which teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-readable modules of a user interface, the computer readable medium comprising: at least one content module that contains content to be displayed via the user interface; at least one navigation module, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 48, 133, and 138, a system for modifying a user interface, the interface comprising both content elements and navigational elements, where the interface optionally doesn't have a default branding. With regard to claim 19, which further teaches a framework module including a first table and a second table both having a plurality of containers, wherein the at least one navigation module is inserted into at least one of the containers of the first table and the at least one content module is inserted into at least one of the

containers of the second table, Anuff teaches, in paragraph 60, a framework for managing the look and feel of the sites content and navigational links. With regard to claim 19, which further teaches a standardized set of styles attributes of which are set to define a plurality of visual characteristics of at least a portion of each of: the at least one content module, the at least one navigation module, and the framework, Anuff further teaches, in paragraph 133, defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of the site, the branding including a theme and structure establishing a collection of styles for a site. Anuff further teaches, in paragraphs 139 and 136, branding of the layout (structure).

19. Anuff teaches defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133), but doesn't specifically state a framework with two tables both having a plurality of containers. Olander teaches the customization of web pages and their corresponding links (see paragraphs 25, 30, and 32), similar to that of Anuff, but further teaches, in paragraphs 28, 34, and claims 1 and 9, a framework where controls (tables) serve as containers for other controls, setting up a system with a plurality of tables with an imbedded set of containers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff and Olander before him at the time the invention was made to modify the adaptable pane system of Anuff to include the hierarchical embedding of elements into tables, as did Olander. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because Anuff points out the structure of sites and sub-site, which could logically be implemented in the imbedded content tables of Olander, to further organize content.

20. With regard to claim 23, which further teaches wherein the plurality of visual characteristics are selected from: colors; heights, widths, spacing around an element, spacing within an element, background images, borders, and fonts, Anuff teaches, in paragraphs 45, 134, and 135, visual characteristics including colors, fonts (letter height and width), layout characteristics, image files, and spacing around elements, for applying specific style attributes to content.

21. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff, Olander, and Kanevsky.

22. With regard to claim 20, which further teach wherein at least one of the framework containers that a content module or navigation module is inserted into expands to fit the inserted content module or the inserted navigation module, Anuff and Olander teach defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133 of Anuff), but don't specifically show containers adapting to content. Kanevsky teaches a system for reformatting the GUI (see paragraph 5), similar to that of Anuff and Olander, but further teaches, in paragraphs 5-10 and 23, dynamically sizing the containers based on the content inserted into the container, where a user sets a minimum and a maximum window dimension. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff, Olander, and Kanevsky before him at the time the invention was made to modify adaptable user interface of Anuff and Olander, to include the sizing of the frame based on the content, as did Kanevsky. One would have been motivated to make such a combination

because this would allows for viewing of a maximum amount content within a container without need for scrolling.

23. With regard to claim 21, which further teaches wherein the framework includes a plurality of containers at least one of which shrinks thereby effectively disappearing from a displayed user interface, Anuff and Olander teach defining a look and feel (branding) of the pages and navigations structure of a site (see paragraph 133 of Anuff), but don't specifically show containers adapting to content. Kanevsky teaches a system for reformatting the GUI (see paragraph 5), similar to that of Anuff and Olander, but further teaches, in paragraphs 5-10 and 23, dynamically sizing the containers based on the content inserted into the container, where a user sets a minimum and a maximum window dimension, and further allows for a transparent window. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Anuff, Olander, and Kanevsky before him at the time the invention was made to modify adaptable user interface of Anuff and Olander, to include the sizing of the frame based on the content, as did Kanevsky. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would allows for viewing of a maximum amount content within a container without need for scrolling and without consuming extraneous screen space.

### ***Conclusion***

24. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to

consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach systems for creating adaptable user interfaces.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis G. Bonshock whose telephone number is (571) 272-4047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 6:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
26. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
27. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

10-26-06  
dgb

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100